



STATE OF NEW JERSEY

In the Matter of Michael Pappano,
Office of Information Technology

**FINAL ADMINISTRATIVE ACTION
OF THE
CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION**

CSC Docket No. 2021-1791

Classification Appeal

ISSUED: SEPTEMBER 7, 2021 (JET)

Michael Pappano appeals the decision of the Division of Agency Services (Agency Services) that the proper classification of his position with the Office of Information Technology is Administrative Analyst 3, Information Systems. The appellant seeks an Administrative Analyst 4, Information Systems or a Data Processing Systems Programmer 1 classification.

The record in the present matter establishes that at the time the appellant filed for a classification review, he was serving as an Administrative Analyst 3, Information Systems. The appellant’s position is located in the Division of Information Technology Service Management, Office of Information Technology, and he reports to Sandra Gallelli, Supervisor, Information Technology. The appellant does not have any supervisory duties. The appellant sought a reclassification contending that his position would be more appropriately classified as an Administrative Analyst 4, Information Systems. In support of his request, the appellant submitted a Position Classification Questionnaire (PCQ) detailing the different duties that he performed. Based on a review of all documentation supplied by the appellant, including the PCQ, an organizational chart, and telephone interviews that were conducted with the appellant, the appellant’s supervisor, and the Deputy Chief Technology Officer, Agency Services initially concluded on March 19, 2021, that the proper classification of the appellant’s position was Administrative Analyst 4, Information Systems. By way of a May 5, 2021 corrected classification determination, Agency Services concluded that the proper classification of the appellant’s position was Administrative Analyst 3, Information Systems.

On appeal, the appellant asserts that the organizational chart for his unit reflects that he could not be reclassified as an Administrative Analyst 4, Information Systems (R29) since his supervisor is serving as a Supervisor, Information Technology (R31). The appellant states that employees serving in the R title cannot report to each other. The appellant explains that, although the organizational chart appears to have invalidated his initial March 19, 2021 classification determination which found that the appropriate classification of his position was Administrative Analyst 4, Information Systems, he maintains that he continues to perform duties that are outside the scope of his current title of Administrative Analyst 3, Information Systems. The appellant now contends that he is performing the duties of a Data Processing Systems Programmer 1 (P29). In support, the appellant provides a description of the duties he is currently performing.

CONCLUSION

The definition section of the job specification for Administrative Analyst 4, Information Systems states:

Under the general supervision of a supervisory official in a State department or agency, performs and supervises the analysis and evaluation of internal operations, business practices, methods, and techniques of an agency to determine optimal solutions and/or approaches to satisfy agency information technology (IT) business needs/initiatives; evaluates users' needs and recommends IT solutions; provides recommendations in support of the agency's business needs and IT goals and objectives; formulates, recommends and/or approves IT policies and procedures; supervises staff and work activities; prepares and signs official performance evaluations for subordinate staff; does related duties.

The definition section of the job specification for Administrative Analyst 3, Information Systems states:

Under general supervision of an Administrative Analyst 4, Information Systems, or other supervisory officer in a State department or agency, performs the analysis and evaluation of internal operations, business practices, methods and techniques of the organization to determine optimal solutions and/or approaches to satisfy IT business needs/initiatives; evaluates users' needs and recommends IT solutions; provides recommendations in support of the agency's business needs and IT goals and objectives; formulates and/or recommends IT policies

and procedures; may function as project leader; does related duties.

The definition section of the job specification for Data Processing Systems Programmer 1 states:

Under direction in one of the data centers listed above or in a subordinate computer center in a State department, agency, institution, or State college, controls and maintains the highly technical operating systems associated with new generations of computers, and directs the operating system, systems design, and programming function toward the optimum utilization of available hardware/software; does other related duties.

In the instant matter, Agency Services properly determined in the May 5, 2021 corrected classification determination that the proper classification of the appellant's position is Administrative Analyst 3, Information Systems. On appeal, the appellant maintains that he is performing duties that are outside the scope of his current position of Administrative Analyst 3, Information Systems, and he now requests a Data Processing Systems Programmer 1 classification.

A review of the appellant's PCQ indicates that the majority of his duties (over 50%) include reviewing databases; ensuring adherence to policies, standards and procedures; recommending improvements; ensuring workflow efficiency; preparing and developing agendas, presentations, reports and training materials; reviewing configuration management plans and making changes for an effective configuration management system; participating in planning, developing, implementing and/or maintaining new and existing systems; reviewing documents including specifications, diagrams, and checklists; reviewing system requirements to ensure compliance with the unit's database; advising management; managing daily workflow; and participating at meetings. Such duties are consistent with those performed by an Administrative Analyst 3, Information Systems.

The appellant did not provide any evidence in this matter to overcome the findings of the May 5, 2021 corrected classification determination. The appellant indicated in the PCQ that his duties do not include supervisory responsibilities. Supervisory responsibilities are defined in the appropriate job specifications as supervising work operations and/or functional programs and having responsibility for employee evaluation and for effectively recommending the hiring, firing, promoting, demoting, and/or disciplining of employees. The appellant also indicated on the PCQ that he does not conduct employee evaluations. Thus, since he does not conduct performance evaluations for subordinate staff, his position cannot be classified as an Administrative Analyst 4, Information Systems. As such, Agency Services issued the corrected May 5, 2021 classification determination finding that

the proper classification of his position was Administrative Analyst 3, Information Systems.

With respect to the appellant's contentions pertaining to the organizational chart, a review of the chart indicates that the appellant's supervisor is serving as a Supervisor, Information Technology, which is an "R31" title. The subordinate employees listed on the chart who report to the appellant's supervisor, including the appellant, are listed as serving in professional, non-supervisory titles. Additionally, the organizational chart reflects that the appellant's supervisor reports to an employee serving in an "M" title. As such, while he is correct that if he were classified in an "R" title that he could not be supervised by his current supervisor, that does not constitute the reason why the request was denied. Rather, it was denied based on the reasons noted above.¹

With respect to the appellant's argument that he is performing the duties of a Data Processing Systems Programmer 1, it is longstanding policy that only those duties and responsibilities assigned at the time of the request for a reclassification are to be considered. Even assuming, *arguendo*, the validity of the appellant's claim, the entire record has once again been thoroughly reviewed in this matter in conjunction with the appellant's appeal and the Commission is satisfied that the corrected May 5, 2021 classification determination was proper. The appellant provided no substantive documentation in this matter to show that the reclassification review was improperly conducted or that a higher classification is justified based on the work he performs. The record indicates that all of his duties and responsibilities were reviewed and the classification determination was based on that information.

Accordingly, there is no basis to disturb the determination of Agency Services that the appellant's position was properly classified as an Administrative Analyst 3, Information Systems. However, if the appellant believes that he is now performing duties that are not consistent with his current title, he may submit a new classification evaluation request.

ORDER

Therefore, it is ordered that this appeal be denied.

This is the final administrative determination in this matter. Any further review should be pursued in a judicial forum.

¹ Further, it would not prevent his reclassification to an "R" title if such designation was warranted. Rather, it would necessitate either a removal of the duties leading to that designation or a restructuring of the supervisory structure of the unit/division.

DECISION RENDERED BY THE
CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION ON
THE 1ST DAY OF SEPTEMBER, 2021

Deirdre' L. Webster Cobb

Deirdré L. Webster Cobb
Chairperson
Civil Service Commission

Inquiries
and
Correspondence

Allison Chris Myers
Director
Division of Appeals
& Regulatory Affairs
Civil Service Commission
Written Record Appeals Unit
P.O. Box 312
Trenton, New Jersey 08625-0312

c: Michael Pappano
Lisa Blauer
Division of Agency Services
Records Center